

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH PERMANENT STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE OFFICE ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today, along with 20 of my colleagues, I will be reintroducing legislation to establish permanent statutory authority for the Public Health Service Office on Women's Health. Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE has introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

With this bill, we hope to create an enduring structure within which the current well-documented ongoing needs and gaps in research, policy, programs, and education and training in women's health will continue to be addressed. It will ensure that important initiatives—in breast cancer detection and eradication, in the promotion of healthy behaviors and disease prevention, in improved public information about women's health, in better informed health care professionals, among others—will reach fruition.

The Public Health Service's Office on Women's Health, established by the Bush administration and now within the Office of the Secretary, is the focal point for women's health activities in the Department of Health and Human Services. By administering cross-cutting initiatives across the PHS, the OWH is able to fill gaps in knowledge, and to initiate and synthesize program activities in ways that no other single PHS agency or office could accomplish alone.

In addition, the bill also makes permanent offices on women's health at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, the Health Resources and Services Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration; these agencies currently have offices or coordinators which were established administratively and could be abolished at any time. Women's health offices at the National Institutes of Health and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration have been made permanent in previous legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this legislation.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. KILDEE and I have introduced a technical amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1965. The amendment makes a technical correction to

the student right to know provisions of the Higher Education Act.

The student right to know provisions of the Higher Education Act require institutions of higher education to report graduation rates for their student body. These statistics are compiled for the student body at large and for student athletes as well. A change made in the fiscal year 1996 omnibus appropriations bill resulted in these rates being calculated at different points in time during the academic year. As a result of this oversight, institutions will be required to keep two sets of records for calculating and reporting graduation rates.

The amendment corrects the problem by conforming the section of the Higher Education Act dealing with the reporting date for student athletes to the section of the Higher Education Act that requires preparation of graduation rates for all students. This amendment will first, allow institutions to more accurately reflect the manner in which institutions collect the data on graduation rates, and second, eliminate the burdensome task of preparing two distinct sets of graduation rates.

I urge all Members to support this technical amendment that simplifies record keeping requirements for institutions of higher education.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL SPORTSMANSHIP DAY, MARCH 4, 1997

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National Sportsman's Day, March 4, 1997. This day, in its celebration of sportsmanship, brings together student athletes from across the United States and 74 countries world-wide in an effort to promote the importance of fair play, integrity, character, and ethics. Teamwork, respect and cooperation, values that are integral for success in society, business, and sports alike, are the themes of the activities for the young people who take part in this day.

Established by the Institute for International Sport located at the University of Rhode Island, National Sportsman's Day is just one element of the institute's efforts to establish a greater awareness in the area of physical fitness. Other year-round components of the institute's efforts are the Student-Athlete Outreach Program, where student-athletes from high schools and colleges visit local elementary and middle schools to serve as positive role models and promote good sportsmanship, and the World Scholar-Athlete Games.

I am proud to offer my support to programs like this that provide students of all ages the opportunity to develop the skills that will help promote success and achievement throughout their lifetime. I would like to acknowledge the parents, teachers, coaches, participants, and especially those individuals who have committed

their time and efforts to broaden participation in the arena of friendly competition and sportsmanship.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE CHILDREN'S PROTECTION FROM VIOLENT PROGRAMMING ACT

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join millions of American parents, teachers, doctors, and children's advocates in endorsing a content-based rating system for television viewing among children. For too long Congress and the American people have left programming content decisions to motion picture and broadcasting industry executives. Parents have expressed frustration with the constant barrage of violence, sex, and adult language on television. I am pleased to join Representatives MARKEY, BURTON, SPRATT, MORAN, and others to introduce a bill that gives parents the ability to determine what type of programming content is appropriate for their children to watch.

Parents are tired of having Hollywood tell them what is best for their children. Congress gave the broadcasting industry a golden opportunity to meet this challenge in the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Instead of addressing these longstanding concerns, the industry proposed an age-based rating system that is still inadequate because it does not inform parents of objectionable programming content. Furthermore, the age-based proposal will continue to prevent parents from making informed choices about their children's viewing behavior. The rapid growth of network and cable programming has been a mixed blessing for parents. They are left with the daunting task of learning the content of numerous shows and channels. The age-based rating system will not help make this task any easier.

I have heard from parents and child advocates all across Oregon who say that they want to know what to expect from a particular television show. They also want to know if the show contains explicit sex, adult language, and excessive violence. Most importantly, they want to make their own decisions about what their own children watch, not leaving the decisions up to television executives. A parent does not want to be told that their child is old enough to watch a "TV-PG" rated show. The majority of parents are smart enough to know that this category is quite broad, covering a wide range of shows.

According to a nationwide survey conducted by the National Parent Teachers Association [PTA], over 80 percent of parents stated that they want separate ratings for sex, violence, and language content to help parents decide what shows their children can and cannot watch. In fact, a large number of organizations have criticized the age-based rating system including the National PTA, the American Medical Association [AMA], the American Academy

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of Pediatrics, the Children's Defense Fund [CDF], Family Research Council, and many others. I am confident that this bill will aid parents with these decisions and encourage the broadcasting industry to adopt a content-specific rating system.

In an attempt to require broadcasters and manufacturers to help parents block shows they considered too objectionable, Congress passed the V-chip law to the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Until this law takes effect in 1998, this bill is the necessary next step in addressing the concerns of parents in the information age.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CONGRESSMEN REGULA AND MURTHA

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call your attention to a special award that was recently given to our distinguished colleagues and longstanding leaders of the Congressional Steel Caucus, RALPH REGULA and JACK MURTHA. Last month, RALPH and JACK were recognized by the American Iron & Steel Institute and the U.S. Department of Energy [DOE] during DOE's Industrial Efficiency Symposium in Arlington, VA.

On February 25, RALPH and JACK received individual awards testifying to their unflagging contributions to the future of the American steel industry. The awards were in recognition of the central role they have played, both as leaders of the caucus and as individual legislators, in creating the metals initiative program within the energy efficiency function of DOE. The metals initiative, a government-industry collaborative program designed to improve the competitiveness of steel and other metal industries, has received \$120 million in appropriations over the past decade to develop direct steelmaking, advanced process controls, and an optical sensor for measuring temperatures.

In their respective positions as chairman and vice chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus, RALPH REGULA and JACK MURTHA have worked tirelessly over the years to promote and expand the economic viability of the American steel industry and the jobs of its workers. The Steel Caucus is a bipartisan organization, which has served as a forum since the 1970's for Members of Congress to exchange information and ideas with steel industry representatives, steelworkers and their representatives, and the administration. And their hard work has paid off handsomely: Today, the American steel industry and its workers are the most productive and efficient in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and my other House colleagues will join me in congratulating RALPH and JACK for receiving this award in recognition of their crucial support for the American steel industry and its workers.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this year's budget debate promises another round of arguments over cutting programs and services to American citizens in order to balance the Federal budget. In that debate, it is time to take a serious look at the wasteful practices that drain the Treasury while subsidizing the developers of natural resources from the public lands.

Today I am introducing a bill, the Public Resources Deficit Reduction Act, that will terminate the very expensive subsidies that taxpayers have long provided to many of the nation's natural resource developers and require, instead, that taxpayers receive the fair market value of the public's resources.

While we often disagree about the precise way to allocate limited Federal resources, I believe we should all be able to agree that we should not waste billions of dollars in taxpayers' money and resources. Yet our natural resources policies, often formulated decades ago when it was necessary to induce people to settle the West, still give away billions of dollars each year in subsidies to mining conglomerates, timber barons and argibusinesses. The taxpayers' largesse benefits some of the wealthiest ranchers and farm operators in the United States, while subsidizing environmental damage that the taxpayers eventually pay to clean up as well.

This bill has a very simple goal: Companies and individuals who use natural resources from public lands—minerals, timber, water, hydropower and forage for grazing—would pay fair market value for those resources. In order to provide a transition period, it exempts all existing contracts and phases fair market pricing in over 5 years. But after 5 more years of taxpayer subsidies, this bill asks natural resource developers to pay the taxpayers what their assets are worth.

The bill also contains a number of specific provisions to ensure that particular programs are altered to eliminate unfair subsidies. It would amend the 1872 mining law to require that the taxpayers receive a fair royalty for gold and silver mined on public lands. It would alter programs in the national parks to ensure that the public receives a fair share of the profits made by the concessionaires. It would set standards for eliminating below-cost timber sales and charging fair market value for grazing and the use of utility rights-of-way across public land. It would move the income from timber and grazing programs on-budget, so that the receipts are accounted for in annual budgeting.

Another area addressed by this bill is the inconsistency of Federal irrigation and farm support policies, which often contradict one another or provide enormous combined subsidies. To address these inconsistencies, the bill would eliminate Federal irrigation subsidies to farmers already receiving payments under the Agricultural Market Transition Act. It also would require that the irrigation subsidies be counted into the cap on farm subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, we have asked all of our citizens to accept some cuts in Federal programs

in order to balance the budget. We told welfare recipients their aid would end after 5 years. This bill would tell our citizens that we can be responsible stewards of the assets they have entrusted to us, and that we will not longer demand that they tolerate wasteful subsidy programs.

In the last Congress, this legislation was introduced with dozens of co-sponsors, including Members of both political parties. It was not even accorded a hearing by the Committee on Resources. The last Congress utterly failed to reform any of the major resource subsidy programs that currently apply to billions of dollars in public resources.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford such indifference again in the 105th Congress. We cannot afford environmental indifference to the consequences of subsidized resource development and usage. And we cannot afford the fiscal burden of maintaining, on the eve of the 21st century, subsidy programs born at the end of the 19th century.

LINDSAY WASHICK WINS PARADE MAGAZINE AWARD

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor Lindsay Washick, daughter of Bob Washick of Conyngham, PA, for winning first place in a contest sponsored by Parade Magazine and the Times-Leader newspaper of Wilkes-Barre, PA.

Lindsay is a 14-year-old ninth grader at MMI preparatory school in Freeland, PA.

Lindsay's article, entitled "Our President's Greatest Challenge," was chosen from six finalists. As a reward as part of the Young Columbus Program, Lindsay will act as a young ambassador on a trip to Ireland in April.

Lindsay is an example of the fine quality of students who are dedicated to learning and expanding their knowledge of the world they live in. The youth of today are tomorrow's future and I congratulate Lindsay on winning first prize.

I am inserting her article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Text from Lindsay Washick:

With November fifth long and gone, the votes have been counted and tallied, and the leader of our country has been decided. Mr. William J. Clinton will be our president for the next four years.

With a new term starting, many people are anxious to see what he'll be concentrating the most on. Will it be drugs, health care, the environment, our involvement in foreign countries, or balancing the budget? All of these issues are very important but every time the very important issues do come up, there is always one that's overlooked—The Young People of America.

I think that the greatest challenge to our new President is to be getting in touch with our young people, and getting them involved.

I just recently turned 14, and am therefore an adolescent. I'm, involved in, and have a wide variety of liking, but when it comes to government, and politics, I'm always the last one to know and/or care. The rest of the nation is in such a tizzy about everything else, that they're overlooking us too. The President goes where the people go, and that's always away from us. But, every now and

again, when we are lucky enough to be brought up, the only things the politicians have to say, are, "Don't do drugs" and "Stay out of trouble." Nothing exciting about that. We hear it from our parents everyday. If it worked, there'd be a lot more happy people in the world.

But, seriously, the President has to get more in touch with the times. He's lacking the excitement we need to keep us interested, and he's boring us to death.

A great example of this would be the voter turnout among our youth. Very, very few young people vote, and why do you think that is? I know why; because we don't care about the politicians. Because we don't think they care about us. Why should we support them if they don't support us? It's not like I'm just gonna wake up one day when I'm 30, and just go, "WOW! I love politics! I think I'm gonna run for President!"

With so many teenagers with this attitude, it's gonna take a lot to get them to turn around and start getting involved and interested. With no signs of Mr. Clinton even pondering to make any changes, it's not looking too good.

I don't want our President to run around listening to Rage Against the Machine, or go to a Smashing Pumpkins concert, or dye his hair blue. That will get our attention, but in the wrong way. He just has to focus more on us. He's always preoccupied with something else, and since we don't vote that much anyway, why should we waste all that time?

It's a sad and vicious cycle that keeps turning and turning.

The President's greatest challenge this term is to get that cycle to stop. He has to—for the future of you, and your country. But since no one has said anything to him yet, it should, unfortunately, take a while.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

HON. MICHAEL D. CRAPO

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation in favor of economic opportunity and vitality. The Fair Labor Standards Act [FLSA] was designed to promote economic opportunity. There have been instances, however, when unintended consequences are revealed. When they do, it is our imperative to correct them properly so that FLSA will be applied consistently and continue to promote basic economic fairness, its original goal. One unintended consequence, however, impacts a major economic force in our country as well as my home State of Idaho: Agriculture.

FLSA itself recognizes that agriculture is a special industry and consequently contains numerous exceptions to the applicability of FLSA's "time-and-a-half-overtime" provisions. Unfortunately, a sugar beet is deemed "not a vegetable" under FLSA. As a result, no overtime is due a farmer's workers if the farmer transports sugar beets from his fields to the processing plant. If a farmer stockpiles his sugar beets in an effort to be more efficient and then contracts transportation with a hauler to bring these same vegetables to that same plant, however, the hauler is nevertheless required to pay his drivers overtime. This occurs even though those plant workers are also exempt from FLSA's overtime provisions. The scenario is not hypothetical; it occurs regularly to one constituent of mine who has for years

been involved in the annual beet haul involving sugar beets. Ironically, applying FLSA to the beet haul actually lowers the compensation that his truck drivers are actually paid.

In Idaho, the beet haul requires farmers to stockpile their crops in beet piles and await the processor's delivery instructions. Once processing begins, it is a 24-hour-per-day, 7 days a week affair, lasting from late September until early January. The most economically advantageous method—to both drivers and their employer—for compensating beet haul drivers is to pay them by the load.

Truck drivers who want to work, hustle loads; they are rewarded for the diligent work ethic. The less motivated worker earns less. Unfortunately, with respect to my constituent—and my constituent alone—the Department of Labor has insisted that FLSA's overtime provisions apply to the beet haul.

In theory, FLSA requires all beet haul operations to pay "time-and-a-half." In reality, my constituent's competitors never have been required to comply with this FLSA provision; that competitor still pays by the load. This is despite the fact that both hauling entities are regulated by the Federal Department of Transportation. The competitor hauls a small percentage from beet piles located in Oregon—that is the only difference. This circumstance harms my constituent since his diligent workers are paid less under this rule and he must still absorb higher labor costs. This disparate treatment has caused my constituent to lose his better drivers repeatedly to his competitor. They earn more working by the load; my constituent pays more because he is not treated the same as other beet haulers.

One might already assume that FLSA's agricultural exemptions would cure this inequity. It does not: a sugar beet as defined under the act is not a vegetable and therefore, the exemption does not apply, even though a sugar beet is, in fact, a vegetable. Consequently, the beet haul does not enjoy the FLSA agricultural exemption which applies to other agricultural endeavors. This inequality thus requires a definitional, that is, a legislative, solution. The legislation I propose is simple, direct, and in no way will interrupt the overall flow and impact of FLSA. This legislation seeks to include sugar beets as vegetables in FLSA. This legislation will level the playing field and enhance one of the actual goals of the statute: economic fairness.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES G. SANDMAN

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Col. James G. Sandman, U.S. Air Force retired, for exceptional service to the community of Sacramento while serving as executive vice president of the Sacramento Association of Realtors since 1979. After 17 years of dedicated service, he and his wife, Barbara, are retiring.

A native Californian, Colonel Sandman's contributions have not been limited to his service with SAR. A member of a prominent Stockton family, he was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1947 and went on to a distinguished career in the

U.S. Air Force until retiring in 1976. One of the highlights of Colonel Sandman's Air Force career was to be stationed at the newly opened Air Force Academy for the graduation of the first class of Air Force cadets.

While serving in the Air Force, Colonel Sandman contributed to his country in a number of very important roles. He served as a command pilot and navigator during the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, served on the Pentagon's Command and Control Staff, was part of a special exchange program and attended the Royal Air Force Staff College in the United Kingdom. His last tour of duty was commander of the Air Force Recruitment Wing for the Western Region. At one point, Colonel Sandman was chosen as the subject for a recruiting poster which was nationally distributed and displayed. During his military career, Colonel Sandman was honored with the Legion of Merit with an Oak Leaf Cluster, the Air Medal, and the Meritorious Service Medal.

Immediately following his Air Force career, Colonel Sandman established himself in the Sacramento community by working on various political campaigns and managing a highly successful shopping center development project.

As executive vice president of the Sacramento Association of Realtors, Colonel Sandman led the organization as it quickly established itself as a concerned member of the community at large. Under his leadership as its chief staff member, SAR became a major contributor to charitable causes in the community and could always be counted on in a crisis. Included among his significant accomplishments are the conversion of a board-owned book multiple listing service to a board-owned computer multiple listing service, the building of a state-of-the-art headquarters for Sacramento Realtors, complete with an auditorium that is used by many organizations in the community, and the initiation of discussion with six Realtor associations in the surrounding areas regarding a regional association system.

Within the broader Realtor community, Colonel Sandman represented SAR with the highest of integrity and dedication. He served as director of the management committee for the Real Estate Land Use Institute, member and chair of the California Association of Realtors' Executive Officer's Committee, member of the National Association of Realtors' Executive Officer's Committee, and several other NAR and CAR Committees, including a stint on the CAR Executive Committee. He has also served on the California Department of Real Estate Task Force on Professional Standards.

Locally, Colonel Sandman is a past trustee of the American Red Cross, is involved with the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, the Sacramento Area Commerce and Trade Organization [SACTO], and regularly contributes to a number of local charities and causes.

As an association executive, Colonel Sandman distinguished himself within that group's ranks as well. He is a past member of the American Management Association and is a member of the California Society of Association Executives. He served as a board member and president of CSAE and was awarded that group's Association Executive of the Year Award in 1987. He also earned the ASAE's highest designation, Certified Association Executive and just recently was awarded the first

and only National Association of Realtors' Lifetime Realtor Certified Executive designation.

In recognition of these contributions made to his country, California and the local Sacramento community, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting James G. Sandman and wishing both he and his wife, Barbara, luck and happiness in their retirement.

TRIBUTE TO LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCILMAN MARVIN BRAUDE

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the extraordinary career of Los Angeles City Councilman Marvin Braude. After 32 years of dedicated service, Councilman Braude will soon return to private life. The city's 11th district, which he has so capably served, overlaps my own district, and includes communities such as Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, and West Los Angeles.

During his eight terms in office, Councilman Braude has been a champion of the environment, a crusader for government efficiency, and a source of wisdom in the development of local public policy. As an elected official, he has been a true renaissance man, at various times in his career serving as chair of the city's Finance and Revenue Committee, the Environmental Quality and Waste Management Committee, and the Public Safety Committee. He has also helped formulate city policy in information technology, public works, and zoning, and land use issues.

A lifelong conservationist and ardent bicyclist, Councilman Braude's leadership made possible the creation of a 50,000-acre public park within the city's limits in the Santa Monica Mountains. This area has been designated as permanent recreational open space and is a beautiful natural oasis within the city's borders.

Councilman Braude's legislative accomplishments have included authorship of the city's pioneering ordinances to protect nonsmokers from secondhand tobacco smoke. He has been honored for his work by the American Cancer Society, the American Lung Association, the League of California Cities, and the California Department of Health Services.

Councilman Braude has also had extraordinary success in sponsoring ballot measures to limit commercial density and to prohibit oil drilling along the city's pristine beaches. In addition, he has been the city council's leader in opening city government to the public and encouraging the participation of all citizens. And, he increased government accountability by creating the zero-based budgeting process that is now used as a management model by many municipalities.

Councilman Braude's commitment to the environment includes serving on the governing board of the South Coast Air Quality Management District, helping to clean the air for 12,000,000 people in southern California. He is also the city's strongest advocate of electric vehicle technology and is helping to bring the entire automotive industry into the future by making the city of Los Angeles a friendly environment for electric vehicles.

Like many of our colleagues, Councilman Braude came to government from the private sector. He founded Capital for Small Business in Los Angeles, and was a founding member of the board of directors of Scientific Data Systems, which later became the computer division of Xerox Corp.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in honoring Councilman Braude for his full and fruitful career in public service, and in wishing him continued happiness and success in all future endeavors.

OFFICER BRIAN GIBSON TAX FREE PENSION EQUITY ACT OF 1997

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Officer Brian Gibson Tax Free Pension Equity Act of 1997, a bill which will allow the survivors of a Federal or local law enforcement officer killed in the line of duty to receive that officer's pension tax free.

This legislation bears the name of Officer Brian Gibson, a brave police officer, a hero recognized as a model by his peers, an example for all who wear a police officer's badge anywhere, and a District of Columbia resident who was laid to rest on February 10 after being fatally shot in the line of duty. Officer Gibson was a devoted family man who left a wife, Mrs. Tracie Gibson, and two children. He graduated from H.D. Woodson High School in the District. Officer Gibson was a family man devoted to his wife, his children, his family, his community, his city, and his Police Department. I name this bill for Officer Gibson to help us remember him and all officers who die in the line of duty, and to help young men understand the meaning of courage, manhood, service, and family.

Current Federal tax law allows officers who retire on disability to collect disability payments tax free. However, Officer Gibson's family must pay taxes on the survivor benefits of his pension. This disparate tax treatment is unfair because whether an officer retires on disability or is killed, that officer's family loses a wage earner, and in many instances, the family's sole wage earner.

This bill is retroactive to taxable year 1997 to enable Officer Gibson's young family and the survivors of other officers killed in the line of duty in 1997 to begin receiving their survivor benefits free of Federal income taxation. For the average officer's family, this bill could mean 28 percent more money in survivor benefits. The police families who have lost their loved ones in police service have lost the irreplaceable. I urge my colleagues to support the Officer Brian Gibson Tax Free Pension Equity Act and afford the families of our slain law enforcement officers the same tax free treatment in survivor benefits we have already granted to officers who retire on disability.

BILL TO ENCOURAGE THE IMPROVEMENT OF TV RATINGS MARCH 4, 1997

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill, along with Representatives BURTON, SPRATT, MORAN, and others, to encourage the television industry to add content labels to the age-based TV ratings. Additional original cosponsors of "The Children's Protection from Violent Programming Act" include Representatives GREENWOOD, KLINK, POSHARD, KENNEDY, J., TAUSCHER, DEFazio, HINCHEY, FILNER, and HOOLEY.

The ratings system proposed by the TV industry last December has proved to be inadequate. It fails to inform parents of objectionable content, and it frustrates the use of blocking categories because they are so broad as to be useless. The V-chip law was intended to give parents the ability to block shows on the basis of violent, sexual, or profane content. Instead, the "V" for violence disappeared into the industry committee that developed the ratings system and has not been sighted since. We need to return to a content-based system.

This point has been made to the industry in every conceivable way—in private meetings, in academic research, in focus groups, in newspaper editorials—yet the industry continues to turn a deaf ear, sticking stubbornly to a system that is convenient for the industry, but condescending and contradictory to parents.

After all, who is raising our kids? Not Hollywood, not the broadcasters, not the cable industry. Parents, not corporations, are raising our kids. If we don't listen to them, the system is indeed a mess.

The system is condescending because it tells parents that "Hollywood knows best", that some industrial Big Brother will decide whether a show is appropriate for your child's age group. Parents don't want this decision left to a corporate executive. We have left the era of "Leave It To Beaver" and entered the era of "Beavis and Butthead." Instead of three channels, we have dozens, with more coming through the miracle of digital compression, satellites, and telecomputers. Today's parents want specific information about the level of violent or sexual material distributed in the form of entertainment to their home, so that they can decide for themselves what is appropriate for their own children to see on their own family TV set.

The system is contradictory because, on the one hand, it requires an executive to examine the show for the level of violence, sex, or language, but on the other hand, it denies that information to parents. Instead, everyone is asked to engage in a game of ratings Hide-and-Go-Seek where the executive disguises what he knows by throwing it into a giant category called "TV-PG".

In fact, an estimated two-thirds to three-quarters of all television programming is being tossed into this Black Hole called "TV-PG." What at first blush appears to be a six category system is, for most purposes, just this one category. It swallows up material that ranges across the entire spectrum of TV programming, from mild to graphic, from silly to

sick, from profound to profane. The clips that you will be shown today by the organization Children NOW make this point very well. "TV-PG" has, unfortunately, come to stand for "Too Vague—Parents Give Up." This is the core of the problem. This is the reality that the industry has, so far, refused to face.

Clearly, parents want and deserve more information than they are getting from these general age-based icons. The head of one of our Nation's largest broadcasting undertaking, Mr. Earvin Duggan of the Public Broadcasting System, put it well in his recent letter to the committee:

"We who serve the television audiences should provide more information about program content rather than less. The ratings system recently adopted by commercial broadcasters and cable is, in our judgment, to a vague, imprecise and grudging in the information it provides."

Fortunately, we do not need to reinvent the ratings wheel. The industry's proposal can be made acceptable to most critics by simply adding content descriptors to the age-based icons. "TV-PG" would become "PG-V", with the "V" indicating violence. Such content-descriptors are already widely used by the American cable industry in the HBO-Showtime system. We already have more than 3 years of experience with this system on three major cable networks, and more than a decade of experience on HBO. The president of Showtime will give testimony later today about the positive reaction to this system, both by his subscribers and by the employees who must preview the shows, and attach the ratings. This approach gives parents the information they want and need without abandoning the progress represented by the industry's efforts to date.

Adding content-descriptors to the industry's age-based icons is clearly the outline of a solution. PBS is willing to do it; four cable networks are already doing it; it is time for everyone to move in this direction.

Nevertheless, we must be realistic about the industry's intransigence. We must ask ourselves what can be done to help parents if the industry refuses to reconsider voluntarily its ineffective system.

To that end, I am introducing, along with Representative DAN BURTON and others, the House version of Senator HOLLINGS' bill (S. 363) to encourage, but not force, distributors of television programming to add specific warnings for violence to the vague age-based ratings already proposed. The legislation does not require content descriptors. If a broadcaster chooses not to send them to parents, that's his right. But under this bill, he would no longer be able to air that unlabeled show during hours when children comprise a substantial part of the audience. It's his choice. If he includes the content descriptors, he can air the show regardless of the number of kids who may be watching. If he doesn't, then he can only air the show when kids are not likely to be watching.

We think this is a fair trade. Parents want a content-based ratings system. Just last Saturday the New York Times poll concluded that 69 percent of parents support this approach.

There is no guarantee that parents will use the system, but there is a much greater likelihood they will use it if they have a clear warning of content that might harm their kids. And only through such ratings will parents be given

reasonable options for blocking out the harmful programming using the V-chip.

It is my hope that the industry will, ultimately, come to the realization that this ratings system is for parents and must meet their needs. Parents should also register their concerns by writing the Federal Communications Commission. The FCC record is open for initial public comment until April 8, and the FCC Chairman has announced his intention to hold a hearing at the Commission sometime after that. The introduction of this legislation should help to focus attention on the importance of this decision and hasten the day when the pleas of parents are finally heard.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation repealing a defect in current Medicare law which often causes beneficiaries seeking chiropractic treatment under the Medicare Program to be subjected to unnecessary x rays exposure. The heart of the problem, which my legislation seeks to correct, arises from current law which requires a diagnostic x ray to be taken before a beneficiary can be provided with chiropractic manual manipulation benefits under Medicare. Frequently, x rays are a useful and valid diagnostic tool properly utilized by doctors of chiropractic. However, the existing statutory requirement that, in every instance, a diagnostic x ray be taken before chiropractic services can be provided as a benefit under Medicare is clearly arbitrary and unnecessary.

According to the American Chiropractic Association [ACA] and ACA College of Radiology, there is no medical justification for a blanket requirement that all beneficiaries seeking chiropractic care under Medicare must first undergo a diagnostic x ray. While in many instances x rays are clinically justified, all responsible health authorities agree, that diagnostic x rays are warranted only when, in the assessment of the treating health provider, they provide a direct clinical benefit to the patient.

I for one, find it totally unacceptable that we, as responsible Members of Congress, would allow the continuance of an artificial statutory requirement that results in the continued unnecessary x ray exposure of Medicare patients. I am confident, that any of my colleagues that examine this issue will conclude, as have I, that requiring an x ray as a prerequisite to reimbursement is bad public policy for which there is no real justification.

This is not just my opinion, but it is also the opinion of senior officials in the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA] and the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS] who have studied this issue in detail. As many of my colleagues know, the ACA and various Members of Congress have, over the past 2 years in particular, talked with the Administration regarding a variety of chiropractic-related issues. As a result of those discussions and inquiries, the mandatory x ray requirement issue has been closely examined by HCFA and HHS. I am pleased to say that as part of this fiscal year 1998 budget pro-

posal, President Clinton has included a specific legislative provision which would abolish this requirement.

Specifically, the proposal I am introducing today, would strike for the physician definition portion of the existing statute describing the chiropractic Medicare benefit [Section 1861(r)(5), Social Security Act], the words "demonstrated by x-ray to exist".

Also, I would note, the existing x ray requirement is a barrier to beneficiary access to chiropractic care which places an undue financial burden on beneficiaries who must often pay for the required x ray out-of-pocket. Chiropractic care is a proven and effective treatment for spinal related maladies including low-back pain. It is a nonsurgical and nondrug form of health care which often substitutes for more expensive forms of care, including surgery. It only makes sense to encourage access to chiropractic care and remove those barriers which exist in current law.

In conclusion, I am confident this proposal, which is first and foremost a matter of public health and safety, will enjoy bipartisan support in this Congress. I urge my colleagues to act quickly to ensure the incorporation of this long overdue proposal into Medicare reform legislation which may be approved in this Congress.

IN HONOR OF THE BIRTHDAY OF LLOYD THOMAS KORITZ, M.D.

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to salute Dr. Lloyd Thomas Koritz, an exemplary physician and a man who has done so much to help in the advancement of medicine. Dr. Koritz has served for more than 40 years as a physician in Rochelle, IL. As a physician-volunteer in numerous experiments at the University of Illinois College of Medicine in Chicago, he placed his mind and body in the hands of research physicians for dangerous experiments to advance the health of humanity.

Dr. Koritz is responsible for a revival technique which is now an established practice throughout the world. To find a more efficient technique of manual resuscitation for electrocuted power line workers, Dr. Koritz volunteers. He was first anesthetized and then placed upon an erected mast to determine the best way of getting more air in and out of the lungs. Dr. Koritz risked his own life repeatedly to discover which resuscitation method was best to help save the lives of millions.

Through Dr. Koritz's service and dedication, a standard method of artificial respiration was established. This method is now used throughout the world to save lives. It has been established for use by all health and safety institutions, governmental, and military units, the Red Cross, the Boy Scouts, and other organizations concerned with health and safety.

Dr. Koritz was recognized with an award as 1 of 10 outstanding men of the United States by the Junior Chamber of Commerce for the courage and dedication he demonstrated in his unselfish quest to advance science.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to salute Dr. Lloyd Thomas Koritz. His leadership and bravery are second to none, and I am pleased to congratulate Dr. Koritz on his birthday and to wish him many more to come.

GIRL SCOUTS WEEK

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to join with me in recognizing the 85th anniversary of the founding of the Girl Scouts of the USA by supporting Girl Scout Week, March 9–15. Today, Girl Scouts of the USA is the largest volunteer organization for young women in the world. Since its beginnings, Girl Scouts has been providing opportunities for girls from all segments of American society to develop their potential, make friends and become an active part of their community.

Founded by Juliette Gordon Low on March 12, 1912, the Girl Scouts have always emphasized selfawareness, values, education, and contribution to society. A recognition system in which members earn badges symbolizing accomplishment of a goal provides a framework in which girls can develop self-esteem and leadership skills.

In celebration of the thousands of dedicated adult volunteers who guide these young women toward success, as well as the 3 million scouts who have made important contributions to communities across the country, I urge my colleagues to join in recognition of Girl Scout Week. With our support and encouragement, the Girl Scouts organization can continue to grow and enrich the lives of countless young women.

 TRIBUTE TO NEGRO LEAGUE
HEROES FROM LINCOLN PARK

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the community of Lincoln Park, which celebrates its 106th anniversary this year.

Lincoln Park is a self-contained community within the city of Rockville, MD. As an African-American community, through the years it has managed to keep rich its traditions and history. Lincoln Park is unique not only for its heritage, but also for how the residents interact together. They have continued to work together as a community in the same manner that their ancestors did long ago. The effort to retain and continue the traditions of their history gives the community respect for their ancestors and a vision of hope for their descendants.

With the month of February designated as a time to celebrate Black History, it is only fitting that a community so rich in its African-American heritage would seek to share and explore its roots. Thanks to the hard work of founding president Anita Neal Powell and vice-president Deacon Leroy Neal, the Lincoln Park Historical Society held their 20th Annual Black History Program at Mt. Calvary Baptist Church on February 28. I wish to pay special tribute to Mr. Russell Awkward and Mr. Gordon Hopkins. These former professional Negro League baseball players will be speaking at the presentation on the topic, "Building Historical Dreams for Our Children." These two fine gentlemen are the only members of the Negro

League living in Montgomery County, MD. I also wish to honor Mr. Elbert Israel and Mr. Clarence Israel, also two former Negro baseball players from Rockville. Clarence Israel died in April 1987, and Elbert Israel passed away just this past October. The story of these men says a great deal about our history and the hopes and dreams for our children.

Russell Awkward grew up with the dream of one day playing for the New York Yankees. He got his professional baseball career started by playing for the Washington Royal Giants. As a player, Awkward had good speed and was a consistent hitter, usually batting first or second in the batting order. He went on to play for the New York Cubans and the Newark Eagles until he was called to military service with the U.S. Army.

Gordon Hopkins played second base for the Clowns for 2 years. He was good at getting the ball in play and was known for his ability to stretch hits into extra bases as well as for his exceptional range in the field. After the 1954 season he was drafted into the armed services, but still played baseball for the U.S. Marines.

Clarence Israel played in the Negro League in the 1940's. He was a decent hitter with good speed and what he lacked in power he made up in hustle. He was a second baseman with the Newark Eagles for 3 years from 1940 to 1942. He then signed with the Homestead Grays to fill an empty spot at third base for the 1943 season. In 1946, he was back with the Eagles and helped them to win the Negro National League pennant for the first time in 9 years. He played three games of the World Series that year and had a pinch hit single off Satchel Paige to help the Eagles win the title. He returned the next season to the Grays for his last year in professional baseball.

Elbert Israel, or Al, as he was called on the field, played with the Philadelphia Stars in the 1950's after the club joined the Negro League. His greatest contribution to the dream of black men in baseball, however, came in 1953 when he joined the class A minor league baseball team in Savannah, GA. Al Israel and four other black baseball players joined the South Atlantic League, the Sally League, as it was called. This league consisted of small towns in the deep South. These five players broke the color barrier in baseball in the most racially divided area of the country. The test for the racial integration of baseball rested on these five men in this class A baseball league.

The courage of these men and determination to follow their dream helped to make it possible for the next generation of African-Americans to enjoy America's pastime at all levels of the game. I hope that everyone will join me in honoring these men and women and wishing the whole Lincoln Park community a most happy and successful 106th anniversary.

 AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION PROVIDES IMPORTANT LEADERSHIP

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined several of my colleagues in

celebrating the 50th anniversary of a very important organization in the fight for a fairer America, Americans for Democratic Action. As examples of the vital role ADA has played and continues to play, I ask that two very thoughtful articles be printed here. One is by Jack Sheinkman, former head of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, who is now the president of ADA and a great fighter for social justice in our country. The other is an interview by Kenneth Adelman with one of the most important non-Members of Congress in history from the standpoint of people who have affected the course of this institution. Evelyn Dubrow, who recently retired as vice president and legislative director of UNITE, the successor union to the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers has an unparalleled record of accomplishment in fighting for the rights of working people. I believe that these two articles make an important contribution to our debate on public policy.

[From the Washingtonian, Jan. 1997]

MADE IN THE USA

(Interview by Ken Adelman)

The new session of Congress will be the first since the Eisenhower administration without Evelyn Dubrow treading the halls of Capitol Hill on behalf of garment and textile workers.

The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union sent her here in 1956, when the minimum wage was a dollar, and she's lobbied for everything from protection against imports to civil-rights legislation. Soon, she'll be stepping down as legislative director of the union, now called UNITE (Union of Needletrades, Industrial, and Textile Employees), but she'll stay on as special assistant to the president.

Liberal politics came naturally to Dubrow. Her parents were socialist immigrants from Belarus who raised four daughters and a son. Her father was a union man. Her sister Mary picketed the White House as an early suffragette. Sent to prison, she went on a hunger strike.

Dubrow grew up in New Jersey and studied journalism at New York University. After her graduation in the late 1930s, she pursued journalism and then union work, with a brief stint in Washington in 1947 to help organize the liberal Americans for Democratic Action and campaign for Harry Truman. She joined ILGWU in 1956 and was sent to Washington the same year. She's been here ever since, living on Capitol Hill to be near her work.

Among her many awards in the Lifetime Achievement Award from Citizen Action. Ladies Home Journal has named her one of the 75 most important women in America, and The Washingtonian has named her one of the region's most powerful women.

Dubrow is single but has loads of nieces, nephews, great-nieces, great-nephews, and now great-greats, whom she considers her children.

In her free time, she plays poker with a group of longtime friends. She also plays plenty of gin rummy, reads the classics—especially Dickens and Trollope—and used to adore going to baseball games.

In her office in the AFL-CIO building, one block from the White House, we discussed what she's learned.

Why is "lobbyist" such a dirty word?

I don't consider it a dirty word at all.

American citizens are constitutionally entitled to petition the government through their representatives for any purpose. The term "lobbyist" arose when members of Congress didn't have offices. So everyone seeing them had to meet in the House or Senate lobby.

Now as government grew, organizations found they had a bigger stake in what happens in Washington. So they hired people like me to represent their members. That's perfectly legitimate.

But lobbyists tend to work for, or even become, fat cats.

Well, I'm not. And I don't.

I work for more than 350,000 union members and 250,000 retirees. They're far from fat cats. They're hard-working citizens who can't trot up to Capitol Hill and meet their representative directly. However, they can and do write letters and call.

How has Congress changed in your time?

Members are much younger. Some, sadly, don't know much about the institution and haven't learned much.

Many of these young Republicans distress me. After the 1994 election, I even broke my own cardinal rule of going to visit each new member. I was so upset at their ignorance and small-mindedness about anyone in this country not like them.

They have less knowledge of the institution, of how to legislate or understand their constituency. They are narrow-minded on guns and the right to choose, affirmative action—oh, you name it!

Has the caliber of members declined?

Yes, it has. Some of these guys obviously decided to run for Congress because they were bored with what they had been doing.

Others run because they hate things. That's what bothers me most—the atmosphere of hate that's grown here. I was used to Republicans and Democrats opposing each other on issues but with some on each side voting for the other position. That happens less nowadays.

And, no matter what, members were friendly. They'd talk to each other. They'd kid one another. There was an overall feeling of being in this together. They'd disagree on issues but never be nasty about it.

Members need that civility. Every issue is different. An opponent one day will be your supporter the next. But there's been a big decline in civility—above all, a decline in respect for the government of the United States of America. That, to me, is saddest.

How do you expect the new Congress to differ from the 104th?

I suspect that it won't be as mean-spirited as it was in the last two years. I think the Republicans as well as the Democrats realize it's going to be important to produce legislation that will be helpful to the people of this country. The Republican leadership realized that their attempt to dictate what the legislative program would be in the 104th Congress didn't work.

I assume, along with everyone else, that there will be more cooperation. However, I see some evidence that members in the leadership of the Republican party still are determined to attack the Democratic leadership. I also think they are likely to try to attack the labor movement through legislation that would be detrimental not only to union members but to American workers generally—such as campaign reform to prevent the unions from raising money from their members, or compensatory-time legislation that would deprive workers of the chance to earn overtime pay.

What works best to persuade members of Congress?

Always be honest. Never play games. Never pretend you know everything about a bill or issue. You don't.

Use constituents, since they're always the best lobbyists. We succeed most when our union members contact their own representatives directly.

Folks at the grassroots, if they ever realized it and wanted to, could run this country. People really do have power. The smart con-

gressmen or senators assign a top staff member full-time to take constituent calls and read mail. Then the member can respond to constituents.

Many times over the years I've asked our folks to send me any correspondence from Congress. When doing so, many attach a note saying, "Please return this. I'd like to keep it since it comes from my member of Congress." That means a lot to them.

What should a lobbyist avoid?

Three things, which I call "my BAT."

One, don't Beg for votes. Second, don't Assume you know everything. And third, don't Threaten anyone by saying you'll work to defeat the guy or gal or anything like that.

Always remember why you're there. As a lobbyist, you're there to get votes. This means you approach anyone who has a vote, regardless of whether you're likely to succeed or not.

I rarely go into an office just to be there. I'm in to talk about an important issue.

I like to win because I'm convincing on the merits. But I know that sometimes a member will vote as a personal favor to me. I don't kid myself about that.

Many of these members I've known for a very long time. They know by now that I won't ask them to support something horrendous. That isn't my way.

I'm very conscious of time, which is their most precious commodity. Members are terribly busy so it's best to have the staff in there too. A good staffer knows the issue as well, if not better.

They'll often ask me to send background or briefing materials. A major part of my job is providing information they can use in the committee or even in floor debate.

When a new session begins, I go in to see new members and their staffs. I try to introduce myself to everyone in the office. Sometimes I'm successful in that, sometimes not. But at least I've made the effort.

So you really like Congress.

Oh, yes. This negativism towards the institution bothers me.

I think Congress is the greatest institution in the whole wide world. I'm corny enough still to be thrilled each time I see the Capitol—day or night. I think it holds the fate of America in its hands.

I do distinguish between the institution and the people in it. Nonetheless, I have great respect for members. Some who've disagreed with me are still people of great stature. A good number are first-rate historians or scholars.

Tell us the best three since you came here in 1956.

That's too hard.

Go on. Try.

Okay. The guy who did most for the people of this country was Tip O'Neill. He understood his job as member and then as Speaker, and he knew his people very well. Lyndon Johnson used his position as majority leader, vice president, and then president to pass many laws that were good for ordinary Americans. He was a consummate politician but still had faith in the people.

Third was my great friend Richard Bolling, who was a protégé of Sam Rayburn's but a great liberal. I worked with Bolling at Americans for Democratic Action and then here. He was a real student of government, especially of Congress.

Any Republicans you respected?

Oh, sure, Senator Charles Mathias of Maryland was a real statesman.

John Sherman Cooper was a great student of the issues. So whenever he spoke, he gained respect on both sides of the aisle.

Third, strangely enough, was Barry Goldwater. He was honest. He'd always give you a direct answer. When he was on your side, he'd fight all the way.

How good a Speaker is Newt Gingrich?

Good in that he sounds like he knows what he's talking about. He has a fine ability, as a former teacher, to express himself with great panache. In fact, he's rare—a Speaker of the House who's actually a good speaker. Now, what he says is something else again.

Why don't you like Newt?

I don't like him he's backed more proposed laws that would harm Americans than anyone I've seen here.

His Contract With America, his opposition to family and medical leave, to healthcare reform, to Social Security, and to the minimum-wage increase were unconscionable. All these laws are good for Americans, especially for the poor.

What most bothers me in his Republican Congress is how they make it seem a crime for anyone to be poor. Like the poor want to be poor.

Some of those folks on the Hill can't get it through their thick heads that, as representatives in a democracy, they should care about the people who most need their help.

As a staunch Democrat and liberal, you must be disappointed in Clinton.

No, I'm not. I always knew he as an economic conservative and a social liberal. Clinton cares about people and about education. He understands our need for good government programs.

But when it comes to economics, he's long been conservative. Remember, he came out of the Democratic Leadership Council. I know those guys over there. I've even worked with them. But I don't kid myself. They're not my brand of liberal.

So Clinton hasn't disappointed you?

He has in missing our passion for fair-trade laws. We've lost hundreds of thousands of jobs because we now must compete with countries that bring their products into America very cheaply.

NAFTA still burns.

It sure does. I tell my people that when we elected Clinton, we didn't elect somebody from the labor movement.

Well, there's never been a president we haven't been somewhat disappointed in.

How great a president is he?

He's been a good president so far. Maybe he can approach greatness.

Who were the best three presidents you've known?

Harry Truman was number one. He did more for the people than anyone. Truman understood better what America's all about. Though he came from the Pendergast mob, he was the most honest man I ever knew.

Then John Kennedy, who exuded concern and a complete grasp of what a president had to be. Kennedy didn't have time to do much, but he left a legacy of turning the US into a young and wonderful country. There were so many things we all had to do back then. And Kennedy had a sense of humor, which you need when you're president—or anything else for that matter.

Third was my great friend Lyndon Johnson. He passed the first civil-rights law and education measures. Johnson had deep respect for the labor movement and liked people of all backgrounds. He used his power to develop programs.

Who was the worst president?

Richard Nixon, without question. He came to the Congress after making Jerry Voorhis, really a very great member, seem like a Communist. Jerry Voorhis actually had an impressive record of fighting Communism from his socialist base.

Nixon did the same thing to Helen Gahagan Douglas when he ran against her for Senate. And what Richard Nixon later did to the institution of the presidency was dreadful.

What was your saddest day?

The day Kennedy was assassinated. I had a funny feeling right before that day. Adlai Stevenson had gone to Texas and told Kennedy, "Don't go. The atmosphere down there isn't good." So I woke that morning with a heavy heart. I was attending a conference, but all day long I thought about Kennedy. So when the news came. . . .

Gone was a leader in whom we all had great faith and hope, cut down before he had a chance to make his mark.

I had sad days whenever people tried to enact right-to-work laws, the whole business of 14B in the Taft-Hartley Act. They were trying to deny people their inherent right to belong to unions, a right given them in the National Labor Relations Act. The right to join together and do things for the common benefit is what democracy's all about.

I've been saddened by our inability to get equitable trade laws passed. I work for a low-wage industry with probably more immigrants and people of diverse backgrounds. They're just trying to make their daily lives a bit better.

Our fight isn't against the workers of other countries. We're against the sweatshops abroad, as we are here.

What episodes from your career will you best remember?

The day Speaker Tip O'Neill instructed the House doorman to give me a chair at the entrance to the House floor because I deserved it. That was a great moment in my life.

I remember fondly being up in Albany making a speech when I got a call at the airport from the White House. Juanita Roberts, President Johnson's secretary, said he was going to sign the education bill and would like me there, along with the president of my union. So I called our union president, Louis Styberg, and we arranged to meet in Washington.

We were there along with members of committees that had pushed the legislation through. After signing the bill, LBJ walked off the platform, pulled me up from my seat, and said, "This little lady is responsible for this bill." Now I don't think that was entirely true, but it sure was nice to hear.

Another happened right after I came down to Washington in 1956 to lobby an amendment to the Landrum-Griffin Act. The act, part of the whole Taft-Hartley approach to unions, among other areas outlawed the use of the secondary boycott. It should not have applied to the garment industry, where there is a direct relationship between the jobber (the main employer) and the contractor who manufactures the garment product. My job was to get the amendment to permit our union to be an exception to that section of the act.

John F. Kennedy, then a senator, agreed to introduce it in the Senate. One of his top staffers told me, "Ev, you're asking him to put his political head on the block."

I said, "Oh, come on. What are you saying? Massachusetts has plenty of garment workers affected by this. It won't hurt Kennedy one bit." And it didn't.

Barry Goldwater had been calling my boss, David Dubinsky, head of our union, who was a very great man. I told Dubinsky to let me see what Goldwater wanted. So I saw him and asked.

He said, "Look, Ev, my family knows the rag business. My sister and I spent a year in the garment district. I understand the problems there." So I called Dubinsky and told him to talk with Goldwater.

Later Dubinsky told me Goldwater said to him, "Hey, that's a smart little girl lawyer you've got down here." I said, "Did you tell Goldwater I wasn't a lawyer?" Dubinsky laughed and said, "No. If he thinks you're a lawyer, that's okay with me."

That began a wonderful relationship. Whenever I'd see Barry Goldwater after that,

he'd ask me: "Well, Ev, what are you on today?" I'd tell him, and most often he'd say, "Sorry, I can't vote with you on that one." We became very good friends.

What have you learned about how Washington works?

Washington's a special little enclave in the grand United States. Too many Washingtonians think they're running the country when they're not. The government still reacts more than it acts.

Here, more than elsewhere, personalities count. Personal relationships matter most. Technologies like e-mail and faxes and the Internet bring the rest of the country much closer to Washington, which is beneficial. Many members now must think of those they hadn't paid much attention to before.

In Washington you should never write off anybody. You'll be surprised where tomorrow's allies come from.

I've learned there's a lot of the patina of Washington social life; it's often who you know—not what you know—that goes a long way. Invitations from certain people mean a whole lot.

I've learned I don't know as much as I thought I knew. Living here's a very humbling experience.

Money plays too large a role here. I resent how much it costs to run for office nowadays. So many members or candidates must go out and beg to be elected.

That's why I've always supported public financing of campaigns. I've never been comfortable with forming PACs. Our strength should be in the people we represent and not the money we hand out.

The first year after a representative gets elected is spent trying to make laws. The second year is spent raising money to be re-elected. This means their productive time is cut in half.

Tell us three big lessons of life.

One is not to think that friends have to agree with you. A broad swath is great. Some of my friends think I'm loony and disagree all the time.

Get to know what this country's all about. I've studied the American Indians, as they fascinate me. I began working with the Congress of American Indians in the 1950s, teaching some of them how to organize their members, how to register, and how to vote. The Navajos have power now because they learned these skills early on.

Get to know our senior citizens. They're wonderful. They vote. They're interested. They'll call. They express themselves honestly.

I've learned that no one's as important as he or she thinks.

It's hard to accept that you'll have to get out of the picture and let somebody else take over some day.

I'm lucky to have lived so long and so well. I try to enjoy every day. So many people touched my life.

Other lessons of life?

My greatest lesson is not to take life so very seriously. You can make a difference, but never think you're Joan of Arc.

Great people came before you. Great people will come after you. If you have an opportunity to make any contribution, be grateful for that.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Jan. 19, 1997]

LIBERALS WORK FROM THE VITAL CENTER
(Jack Sheinkman)

As President Clinton prepares to deliver his second inaugural address on Monday, the political landscape seems remarkably familiar to liberals.

A half-century ago, on Jan. 3, 1947, about 130 of the nation's leading liberals met at the

Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C., to discuss challenges which, in a broad sense, are similar to those faced today.

A hostile Republican majority controlled Congress. The president, Harry Truman, was a Democrat, but one whom many considered insufficiently liberal. A new American economy, marked by technological change, was emerging. In the area of race relations, America's reality failed to match its ideals. Abroad, the United States confronted a rapidly changing new world order.

Liberals who attended the meeting included former first lady Eleanor Roosevelt; theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, perhaps best remembered today as the author of the "Serenity Prayer"; historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr.; economist John Kenneth Galbraith; labor presidents Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers and David Dubinsky of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Sen. Paul Douglas, D-Ill.; and Hubert H. Humphrey, the mayor of Minneapolis, who in 1948 would be elected to the U.S. Senate and then as vice president in 1964.

Nelson Poynter, former editor and president of the *St. Petersburg Times*, also was present, as was Barry Bingham of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*.

Out of the meeting, Americans for Democratic Action, today the nation's oldest independent liberal organization, was born. In her syndicated newspaper column, "My Day," on Jan. 6, 1947, Mrs. Roosevelt declared that ADA was needed "to carry on the spirit of progress" in America. "We do not believe that what has been done in the past is the highest attainment that can be hoped for in a democratic nation."

The following year, in 1948, ADA led the successful fight for a strong plank in the Democratic Party platform defining the party's commitment to civil rights. It was only the beginning, as ADA also participated in the civil rights struggles in the South in the 1950s and 1960s. On May 4, 1963, after Sheriff Bull Connor turned police dogs and fire hoses on marchers in Birmingham, Ala., ADA leaders met with President John F. Kennedy in the White House and pressed him for greater federal action in support of civil rights. The moment was a turning point, leading up to Martin Luther King's March on Washington in August 1963 and passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Over the years, ADA pushed for increases in the minimum wage, full employment, Medicare, abortion rights, environmental protections, arms control and an end to apartheid. It also was distinctly anti-Communist in origin, and supported the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization early in the Cold War; but, in the 1960s, opposed the Vietnam War.

In the 1970s, the organization was attacked by Vice President Spiro Agnew and its members were included on President Nixon's infamous "Enemies List." In turn, ADA became the first national organization to call for Nixon's impeachment.

Though many Americans consider liberals to be heroes, we often are pointed as "pinkos," socialists, Marxists or worse. During the 1996 campaign, Bob Dole and other Republican candidates attacked Democrats as "liberal, liberal, liberal," they were singing an old song, one perfected by Joe McCarthy, Richard Nixon and Spiro Agnew in past elections; only this time it didn't play. Americans instead were looking to core values.

And, in fact, America's core values are liberal values. I believe that many Americans are more liberal than they themselves realize.

Let's look at some basic definitions. First and foremost, liberals believe in liberty, equality and opportunity for individuals. We

also believe in the Constitution, which created a national government to act for the common good, along with a Bill of Rights to protect the freedoms of ordinary citizens. We believe in the legacy of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, which includes a commitment to economic security for all Americans, and the need for American leadership within an international community.

Liberalism does not mean big government. Liberals instead want effective, efficient and caring government, and therefore have supported many of President Clinton's and Vice President Gore's "reinventing government" initiatives.

Liberals believe in a progressive tax system in which people (and corporations) pay a fair and equitable share relative to their benefits from our economic system. We also believe in rational budget priorities—including deficit reduction—but not necessarily a balanced budget as any kind of absolute, magical economic cure.

Since 1994, the Republican vision has been to dismantle the federal government and the liberal foundations that sustained America's progress over the past 60 years. It is a vision that would return America to 19th-century laissez-faire capitalism, leaving ordinary people and communities at risk.

It is a vision that is incompatible with helping Americans cope with rapid economic and technological change.

Although the economy has improved since 1992, Americans still suffer from a steady decline in their standards of living. Each year in the 1990s, real wages decreased among even the most highly educated workers. Fully 80 percent of American families were worse off in 1995 than in the 1970s. Nonetheless, from 1973 to 1995, there has been a 25 percent gain in productivity, with significant increases in profits for corporate America and increases in compensation for corporate executives.

Even though unemployment seems relatively low, unemployment rates for blacks and Hispanics remain at about 10 percent, almost double the rate for white workers. When discouraged workers and people working part-time due to economic conditions are included, the "real" rate of unemployment jumps to about 10 percent.

These economic trends represent not only economic hardship for individuals, but also the unraveling of America's social fabric: straining families, pitting generation

against generation, and worsening relations between races. As a nation, we increasingly are at risk of coming apart, rather than pulling together to build a common future.

In 1995, the Republican Congress sought to cut funds for Medicare, Medicaid and education. President Clinton successfully resisted; however, he acquiesced to giving the Pentagon billions of dollars that it had not requested, and the, after two vetoes, signed a welfare reform bill that eliminates assistance to many poor Americans, without doing anything meaningful to help them find jobs.

Last year, ADA was the first national organization to endorse President Clinton for re-election. In doing so, we called on liberals to join moderates and true conservatives to fight for the vital center of American politics. Our cry recalled ADA founder Arthur Schlesinger's 1949 book *The Vital Center*, which presented liberalism as middle ground between the rigid ideological doctrines of left and right.

As the president approaches his second inaugural, liberals can celebrate with him, but we still expect to disagree with him from time to time. Liberals who were not afraid to confront Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy, in order to move them toward a more forthright embrace of civil rights, will not hesitate to confront President Clinton and the Republican Congress whenever we disagree with them on vital policy matters. Just as liberals gathered in 1947 out of concern for America's future, we must do so again, 50 years later, to chart a course for the next 50.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SHELDON AND MIRIAM ADELSON

HON. BILL PAXON

OF NEW YORK

HON. SUSAN MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Molinari and I rise today to congratulate our dear friends, Sheldon and Miriam Adelson on the recent birth of their son, Adam. In addition to their distinguished public lives, Sheldon and Miriam

will now take on new private roles as parents, teachers, and role models for their son.

Sheldon Adelson has spent nearly half a century building a worldwide reputation as an entrepreneur and visionary businessman. He is not only one of the most influential leaders in today's convention, hotel, travel, and gaming industries, but has earned a reputation as a top executive in the computer industry. He is also active in the international business arena, particularly in Israel where he is involved in fostering trade, manufacturing, and software development for Israeli high-technology companies, and creating new forums that show the world the advantages of doing business with Israel.

Sheldon also has a long record of public and private support of the State of Israel. In addition to his numerous philanthropic activities for the Jewish community in the United States, he has shown his true dedication to building a strong and secure Israel.

Miriam Adelson has devoted her career to medicine, specializing in the fields of internal medicine and emergency medicine and most recently, chemical dependency and drug addiction. In 1986, Dr. Adelson was invited to be a guest investigator and associate physician at Rockefeller University in New York City where she studied chemical dependency and drug addiction. Her experiences as a witness to the devastating effects drug addiction has had on this country led her to commit herself to preventing and treating drug addiction in her homeland of Israel before it reached epidemic proportions.

She has shown her commitment to this cause by building the Dr. Miriam Adelson and Sheldon G. Adelson Clinic for drug abuse treatment and research in Tel Aviv, Israel's first drug treatment and research center in a hospital setting. This clinic opened in June 1993 and a second Adelson clinic is being built at the Poriah Hospital in Israel's Galilee region.

As new parents ourselves, we know the joy and happiness that a child brings to our lives. We again congratulate Sheldon and Miriam on the birth of their son and wish all of them the best of luck for the future.